

**Remarks**

The Examiner rejected claim 24 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamura (US 6,308,825) and indicated that all the other claims (1-23 and 25-34) are allowable. The rejection is traversed. Claims 1-34 remain in the application.

In his rejection, the Examiner stated that Nakamura discloses all the limitations of claim 24 in a similar device comprising a retention member slidably received in a chamber and a rod-contacting face. MPEP § 2131 provides: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Contrary to the Examiner's statement that Nakamura discloses all the limitations, Nakamura does not disclose a rod-contacting face oblique to the first passageway and to the slide direction. Therefore, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 24 in view of these remarks and allowance of the application.

This amendment is being sent within three months of the Office Action so no extension of time petition fee should be due. Authorization to charge any fees deemed necessary for consideration of this response to Deposit Account No. 12-0090 is hereby given. If the Examiner

thinks a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,  
Christopher J. Verdigets et al.

Date:

May 14, 2004

By:

James T. Cronvich

James T. Cronvich

Reg. No. 33163

Laitram, L.L.C.

220 Laitram Lane

Harahan, LA 70123

Telephone: (504) 733-6739, ext. 1243

Fax: (504) 734-5233